

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Old Atty. Docket No.: 067470.0159  
New Atty. Docket No. P0808

Serial No.:10/692,641  
Filed: Oct. 24, 2003

Page 8 of 10

**Remarks**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the August 9, 2005 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

**Address Change**

Please direct all future communications with regard to this application to the following address. A power of attorney change is included with this Office Action:

**James T. Hagler**  
Patent Department  
Iomega Corporation  
10955 Vista Sorrento Parkway  
San Diego, California 92130  
(858) 314-7152 Tel. / (858) 314-7005

**Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102**

Claims 1, 7, 8, 16, 19, 20, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,067,211 issued to Chliwnyj, et al. The rejection asserts that Chliwnyj allegedly teaches each element of the claims.

Applicant amends Claims 1 and 20 herein to clarify that in the present invention, the head is being moved from a first zone to a second zone. In the first zone, the head is adjacent to the storage surface and can read and write information to/from the surface. In the second zone, the head is removed from the storage surface and can come in contact with the head cleaner in the second zone. In Chliwnyj, the head does not move from a first zone to a second zone. In fact, the head does not really move at all. It is only in the present invention that the head is moved from a first zone where data transfer may occur into a second zone where head cleaning may occur.

Claims 7, 8, 16, 19, and 20 depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claims 1 and 20, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7, 8, 16, 19, and 20

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Old Atty. Docket No.: 067470.0159  
New Atty. Docket No. **P0808**

Serial No.:10/692,641  
Filed: Oct. 24, 2003

Page 9 of 10

are likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claims 7, 8, 16, 19, and 20.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-6, 9-15, 17, 18, and 21-27 are indicated to contain allowable subject matter if rewritten to overcome the objection. Applicants maintain that in light of the amendments and arguments to Claims 1 and 20, Claims 2-6, 9-15, 17, 18, and 21-27 are now in condition for allowance. However, Applicants reserve the right to rewrite Claims 2-6, 9-15, 17, 18, and 21-27 in independent form to ensure allowability.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION  
Old Atty. Docket No.: 067470.0159  
New Atty. Docket No. P0808

Serial No.:10/692,611  
Filed: Oct. 24, 2003

Page 10 of 10

Summary

In view of the above amendments and remarks, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.


No fees are believed due with the filing of this response. However, if Applicants are in error, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to debit Applicant's Deposit Account (No. 50-2733) any fees that are currently due, as well as any fees due during the pendency of this application.

Certificate of Facsimile

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any referred to as attached) is being sent via facsimile to 703-872-9306 to the Commissioner for Patents on the date indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 19, 2005

By:   
James T. Regier  
Reg. No. 40,631

OMEGA CORPORATION  
Patent Department  
10955 Vista Sorrento Parkway  
San Diego, California 92130  
Telephone: (858) 314-7152  
Facsimile: (858) 314-7005